

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT CHATTANOOGA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	Case No. 4:21-cr-14
v.)	Judge Atchley
)	Magistrate Judge Steger
JASON MICHAEL NEWSOM)	

ORDER

On November 1, 2023, United States Magistrate Judge Christopher H. Steger filed a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) [Doc. 84] recommending Defendant’s Motion to Suppress [Doc. 74] be denied. Neither party has filed any objections to the R&R, and the time to do so has now passed.¹

The Court has nonetheless reviewed the R&R, as well as the record, and agrees with Magistrate Judge Steger’s well-reasoned conclusions. Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Steger’s findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth in the R&R [Doc. 84]. Defendant’s Motion to Suppress [Doc. 74] is hereby **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Charles E. Atchley, Jr.
CHARLES E. ATCHLEY, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Magistrate Judge Steger advised that the parties had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive any right to appeal. [Doc. 84 at 8 n.7]; *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (“It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate judge’s factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.”).